UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/676,270	09/28/2000	David Kammer	PALM-3197.US.P	6725

49637 7590 01/19/2007

BERRY & ASSOCIATES P.C.
9255 SUNSET BOULEVARD
SUITE 810
LOS ANGELES, CA 90069

EXAMINER	
LY, NGHI H	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2617	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/19/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/676,270	KAMMER, DAVID	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nghi H. Ly	2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 January 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-9 and 11-26* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-9 and 11-26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

The Art Unit location of your application in the USPTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Art Unit 2617.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. **a**. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-9 and 11-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

b. Applicant's arguments filed 01/02/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On page 2-8 of Applicant's remarks, Applicant argues that that there is no suggestion to combine the references.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the motivation to do so found in the references themselves in order to provide a system and method for saving and reusing name and address mappings (see Kephart, column 1, lines 6-9) *and* in order to provide a method and apparatus for prioritizing communication in a two-way communication system (see Lin, column 1, lines 6-10).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3-9 and 11-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kephart et al (US 6,026,445) and further in view of Lin et al (US 5,592,154).

Regarding claims 1, 9 and 18, the Applicant's admitted prior art teaches in an initiator device having a wireless transceiver (see BACK GROUND ART pages 1-7), a method for discovering a name of a responding device (see BACK GROUND ART pages 1-7) comprising: broadcasting a first wireless signal to be received by the responding device (see BACK GROUND ART pages 1-7), receiving a second wireless signal from the responding device (also see BACK GROUND ART pages 1-7), the second signal sent in response to the first signal and comprising an address for the responding device (also see BACK GROUND ART pages 1-7).

The Applicant's admitted prior art does not specifically disclose accessing a memory cache comprising names of devices, determining whether a name for the responding device is present in the memory cache, transmitting a request for a name to the responding device provided a name for the responding device is absent from the memory cache, receiving a name for the responding device in response to the request.

Kephart teaches the second signal sent in response to the first signal and comprising an address for the responding device (see Abstract, column 3, lines 44-60 and column 4, lines 26-39), accessing a memory cache comprising names of devices, determining whether a name for the responding device is present in the memory cache (see Abstract, column 3, lines 44-60 and column 4, lines 26-39), transmitting a request for a name to the responding device provided a name for the responding device is absent from the memory cache (also see Abstract, column 3, lines 44-60 and column 4, lines 26-39), receiving a name for the responding device in response to the request (also see Abstract, column 3, lines 44-60 and column 4, lines 26-39).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Kephart into the system of the Applicant's admitted prior art in order to provide a system and method for saving and reusing name and address mappings (see Kephart, column 1, lines 6-9).

The combination of the Applicant's admitted prior art and Kephart does not specifically disclose the name is indexed in the memory cache using the address for the responding device and wherein the name is retrievable from the memory cache sing the address.

Lin teaches the name is indexed in the memory cache using the address for the responding device and wherein the name is retrievable from the memory cache sing the address (see column 9, line 66 to column 10, line 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Lin into the system of the

Applicant's admitted prior art and Kephart in order to provide a method and apparatus for prioritizing communication in a two-way communication system (see Lin, column 1, lines 6-10).

Regarding claims 3 and 21, the combination of the Applicant's admitted prior art, Kephart and Lin further teaches removing from the memory cache an entry for one of the devices when a total number of cache entries exceeds a predetermined limit, the entry comprising a name and an address (see Kephart, column 2, lines 61-67 and column 4, lines 40-51).

Regarding claims 4 and 15, the combination of the Applicant's admitted prior art, Kephart and Lin further teaches an entry is removed from the memory cache according to an aging scheme, wherein the aging scheme ranks entries according to frequency of use (see Kephart, column 2, lines 61-67 and column 4, lines 40-51).

Regarding claims 5 and 12, the combination of the Applicant's admitted prior art, Kephart and Lin further teaches updating the memory cache when the name for the responding device is changed (see Kephart, column 2, lines 61-67 and column 4, lines 40-51).

Regarding claims 6, 11 and 20, the Applicant's admitted prior art further teaches displaying the name on a display of the initiator device (see BACK GROUND ART pages 4-5).

Regarding claims 7, 16 and 25, the combination of the Applicant's admitted prior art further teaches the initiator device and responding device are short-range-enabled devices (see BACK GROUND ART pages 1-7).

Regarding claims 8, 17 and 26, the Applicant's admitted prior art further teaches the initiator device is a portable computer system (see BACK GROUND ART pages 1-7).

Regarding claim 13, the combination of the Applicant's admitted prior art, Kephart and Lin further teaches storing in the memory cache an entry for each of a plurality of other responding devices, the entry comprising a name and an address (see Kephart, Abstract, column 3, lines 44-60 and column 4, lines 26-39).

Regarding claim 14, the combination of the Applicant's admitted prior art, Kephart and Lin further teaches removing from the memory cache an entry for one of the responding devices when a total number of cache entries exceeds a predetermined limit (see Kephart, column 2, lines 61-67 and column 4, lines 40-51).

Regarding claim 19, the combination of the Applicant's admitted prior art, Kephart and Lin further teaches broadcasting a second wireless signal to be received by the responding device (also see BACK GROUND ART pages 1-7), receiving the address from the responding device in response to the second wireless signal (also see BACK GROUND ART pages 1-7), and retrieving from the memory cache the name corresponding to the address (see Kephart, column 2, lines 61-67 and column 4, lines 40-51).

Regarding claim 22, the combination of the Applicant's admitted prior art, Kephart and Lin further teaches storing in the memory cache an entry for each of a plurality of responding devices, the entry comprising a name and an address (see Kephart, column 2, lines 61-67 and column 4, lines 40-51).

Regarding claim 23, the combination of the Applicant's admitted prior art, Kephart and Lin further teaches removing from the memory cache an entry for one of the plurality of responding devices when a total number of cache entries exceeds a predetermined limit (see Kephart, column 2, lines 61-67 and column 4, lines 40-51).

Regarding claim 24, the combination of the Applicant's admitted prior art, Kephart and Lin further teaches an entry is removed from the memory cache according to an aging scheme, wherein the aging scheme ranks entries according to frequency of use (see Kephart, column 2, lines 61-67 and column 4, lines 40-51).

Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nghi H. Ly whose telephone number is (571) 272-7911. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am-5:30 pm Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Appiah can be reached on (571) 272-7904. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Nghi H. Ly